

**ATTACHMENT 3.1.1  
AUGUST 14, 2002 MEETING MINUTES**

**FORECASTING TECHNICAL TASK FORCE  
SEPTEMBER 4, 2002**

# MEMO

**DATE:** September 4, 2002  
**TO:** Forecasting Technical Task Force Members/Subregional Coordinators  
**FROM:** Planning Data and Forecasting  
**SUBJECT:** August 14, 2002 Meeting Minutes

---

## FTTF/SUBREGIONAL COORDINATORS

### MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2002

#### 1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Bill Gayk, of CSUF/CDR. The group proceeded with self-introductions.

#### 2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comments were put forth.

#### 3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

##### 3.1 Approval Item

**Action:** The minutes of July 31, 2002 were approved unanimously by the joint committee with slight modifications.

#### 4.0 ACTION ITEM

##### 4.1 Local Review Procedures

Ms. Jihong McDermott, of SCAG, highlighted changes that were requested by the joint committee at the previous meeting. Ms. McDermott referred to page eleven of the agenda and identified the thresholds that will be used for collecting the important development projects. Mr. Ron Taira, of OCTA, contributed this information. The thresholds recommended by Mr. Taira were derived from the Institute of Transportation and Engineering (ITE) trip generation table. On the Socioeconomic Trend Projections for the 2004 RTP Local Review Form, Ms. McDermott identified a return date change on the form to November 15, 2002. Additional “disagree” choices were added beneath the “agree” choice area. The disagree options are 1) Disagree with population projections; 2) Disagree with household projections; and 3) Disagree with employment projections. Ms. McDermott said that in the signature area, both “agree” and “disagree”

choices are available. There are two areas designated for signature, 1) contact information and signature and 2) approval information and signature (planning director or equivalent position). Ms. McDermott said that staff decided to continue with "Please provide suggested data" rather than the committee's suggestion of the phrase "Please provide revised data." Ms. McDermott said that in the local review process, all of the local jurisdictions will provide suggested revisions and all of the regional criteria will be used to evaluate the suggested revisions by the local jurisdictions. Ms. McDermott also discussed the Socioeconomic Variables Definitions page which was requested by the committee for further clarification. Lastly, the data sample was presented. The detailed data by census tract will be provided as an electronic file on CD or disk for local review. Ms. Gail Shiomoto-Lohr, of OCCOG, suggested that beneath the two agree choices on the Socioeconomic Trend Projections for the 2004 RTP Local Review Form, the three following choices be added: 1) Agree with population projections; 2) Agree with the household projections; and 3) Agree with employment projections. Mr. Warren Teitz, of MWD, asked for a collection of information on the number of units for each project. Ms. Huasha Liu, of SCAG, agreed with Mr. A. J. Wilson, of the Pomona Valley Educational Foundation, that a sample appendix form with project locations be added. The form will list project, name, completion date, and size of the project. Mr. Taira requested a schedule with clarification of the trend projection, baseline projection, and plan forecast. Ms. Liu said this schedule could be provided.

**Action:** The local review procedures were approved unanimously by the joint committee with modifications as described above.

## **5.0 INFORMATION ITEM**

### **5.1 Regional Criteria**

Mr. Gayk explained the importance of the regional criteria and its large impact upon the projection.

Mr. Corrie Kates, of Indian Wells, and Mr. Srini Bhat, of SCAG, were introduced to the meeting via videoconference.

Mr. Gayk introduced Mr. Steve Levy, of CCSCE, who provided an overview of the growth forecast process. Mr. Levy said that the FTTF has been discussing regional projections, trend projections, and their disaggregation into local jurisdiction and census tract projections for the review of the cities for the past 8 months. Mr. Levy said the review is the beginning of a whole sequence of checks and balances on the initial regional trend projections. Some of the important questions are: 1) How do they conform with what the cities think is going to happen?; 2) Is there enough water?; 3) Are there environmental constraints?; 4) Do these regional trend projections raise environmental justice issues?; 5) What about transportation and airports?; and 6) If there are problems, then what does the Regional Council and the region want to do about them?

Mr. Levy said that if the joint committee concludes that enough housing cannot be built and the Regional Council concludes that housing must be balanced with jobs, then this issue must be resolved. Mr. Levy explained that this is still an intermediate step of information gathering (including the local input) so that the policy making bodies can decide what to do. Mr. Levy said the joint committee has made some powerful commitments in sending ahead the regional trend projections. Mr. Levy said that under the trend projection, the region is projected to grow slightly faster than the nation. We are also in an era of numerous retirements due to the aging of the population. As a result of these factors, population growth is projected to exceed job growth.

Mr. Levy said that is the first time that this has happened in recent memory. Mr. Levy said this is implicit in the regional projections and will probably be the most contentious issue during local review because we have all agreed that household formation is going to match job growth. Mr. Levy said that because of declining fertility rates and the aging of the population, persons per household over the next thirty years is expected to decline. If all the subregions proceed with the recommendations, Mr. Levy believes they will come back and say that enough housing cannot be built.

Mr. Levy said that under the perfect scenario with everyone marking the “agree” box, it is still an intermediate stage. The trend projections are going to go through an environmental, transportation, infrastructure and environmental justice scans.

Mr. Levy said that the objective is to get as close as possible to the regional projections that were approved. Mr. Levy said this is the reason it is necessary to examine regional, and perhaps major subregional balance.

Mr. Levy said that Ms. Liu wanted the joint committee’s opinion on the level of quantitative detail required. The trend projections indicate that the region will add jobs at a rate slightly faster than the nation. Mr. Levy said that if the employment numbers are very high an allocation procedure would be required. It is possible that cities have sufficient land for employment and might result in a higher employment total than in the trend projection. Mr. Levy said that all input on employment will need to be evaluated. national growth rate. This evaluation could show new evidence that this region had lost competitive advantage. This could be one kind of criteria about jobs. Mr. Levy said that it is possible that when the household projection input is received, it will be lower than the number at the regional level that went out for trend projections. If it is not lower there is no problem. If it is lower, there are three ways of dealing with that issue. Mr. Levy said that one alternative is to lower the job projections to be consistent with the housing projection. The Regional Council can discuss about whether that is something they want to allow to happen. The construction of housing would be a constraint on the economic growth of the region. Mr. Levy said that would be consistent if the numbers went down together. If the housing numbers went down, but the job numbers stayed the same, or the job numbers stayed the same but the population went way down or up, that would raise some issues about regional criteria. It would push the unemployment rate either negative or to 14%. Mr. Levy said there was a series of regional growth forecast that with a regional unemployment rate of 12%. Mr. Levy said that if the job

projections did not change and the population was even lower, the argument would then be that elderly workers were going to maintain 60%-70%-80% labor force participation rates because that is the only way jobs could be filled from the population. If the unemployment rate, the labor force participation rate, and the ratio of jobs to workers came back and there was a job and a half for every worker, (it is now 1.05). There would be a regional criteria consistency issue. If persons per household were going up instead of down, that would violate the analysis of the regional trend projections and discussion would have to take place about whether there was a reason to revisit that or not. The regional numbers imply ratio of jobs to housing of people and of labor force participation rates. Mr. Levy said that these criteria are all there and can be spelled out.

Mr. Levy said the transportation model, and perhaps the environmental and environmental justice modeling, will be sensitive to the distribution of the regional totals. Mr. Levy asked before that, do we want to have subregional criteria? Mr. Levy asked if it makes sense to say, 'We have regional balance, but all the jobs are way out in the Inland Empire, and all the cities that allow for housing are in Santa Clarita.' Mr. Levy said that it balances at the regional level, but questioned whether that violates some subregional criteria. Mr. Levy said the numbers will probably be added up by county or subregion without presuming that there is any necessity for them to balance and bring them back to the joint committee collectively to review.

The joint committee responded affirmatively when asked by Mr. Levy if there should be some criteria.

Mr. Wilson suggested that there be some sort of guidance to the local input process. Mr. Wilson said there is a need to tell the communities when sending out the information, that there will be some evaluation criteria. Mr. Gayk said that the criteria will be discussed at the workshops. Mr. Gayk said that the jurisdictions should at least be informed that there could be some modification based upon whether in fact the criteria are met. Mr. Gayk said this provides staff latitude for making some adjustments, if in fact the transportation system does not work, or if there is a -3 % unemployment rate or a 15% unemployment rate.

Mr. Levy said that the regional criteria gives staff the opportunity to change the city inputs. They are going to be used to say that the sum of the numbers does not add up and some changes will have to be made.

Ms. Liu asked the committee to study the information in the agenda packet regarding the regional criteria. Ms. Liu said the purpose of the meeting discussion is to maximize the categories that should be taken into account when the criteria is established. Ms. Liu wanted to know if anything was missing from the process that should be added before even getting into how to establish the quantified ratios and criteria. Ms. Liu said in addition to the criteria at the regional level, there should be a good balance at the local jurisdiction level through the local review process. Ms. Liu stressed the importance that everything make sense, especially at the local level. Ms. Liu said that she agreed with

Mr. Levy that there are different levels and/or layers of criteria (regional, county, subregional, local).

Ms. Liu said she agreed with Mr. Gayk's request for a definition of reasonableness and a range. Ms. Liu said there are two basic concepts associated with the criteria. One, is the ratio, which is the relationship among different variables (ex. population, households, jobs, etc.). Second, is the percentage of the growth that is projected and what that range will be. The ratio can be a range and percent of the growth could be a range as well. Ms. Liu said that the importance of this meeting is to capture all of the different perspectives and possible factors.

Mr. Wilson said one criteria is to make the total collection of information statistically credible, which in a broad-brush is one criteria from the point of view of the census, etc. Mr. Wilson said also there will be a criteria that includes practical infrastructure and loading criteria. Third, there are environmental criteria. The inputs will have to be looked at upon their ability to meet the standards of environmental justice, air quality, etc. Mr. Wilson suggested that it be said up front to the local governments, that these three areas will be looked at and that after the inputs are received, general guidance is presented. Ultimately, a collaborative process will be arrived at for the final projection that meets the regional statistical criteria, regional practical infrastructure and regional environmental standards.

Mr. Gayk summed up Mr. Levy's and Mr. Wilson's comments saying that the local input is going to be reflective of what the local policy is and the direction that it is going. And the plan forecast could have a different perspective.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr recognized that the regional criteria need to be adopted by November 2002 and the local input process start in mid-September. One of the regional criteria issues outlined is transportation infrastructure and overcapacity. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr asked if while the socio-economic data is under review by the locals in mid-September, whether there could be a modeling run of the Year 2000 base year data, to identify if there are already transportation infrastructure capacity constraints in the region, for the Year 2000 base year condition. By factoring in the existing transportation improvements, as well as the committed RTIP projects, regional hotspots would be known, the additional transportation capacity of our committed RTIP improvements would be identified, and the base year modeling output would provide a reality check against observed transportation patterns. Ms. Lohr felt this would be a good start for discussion of transportation infrastructure constraints before the local input process is completed.

Ms. Liu responded by saying that the modeling group is in the process of performing the 2000 model validation because the transportation model has been validated against 1997, not for 2000 yet. Ms. Liu said the 2000 model validation will take one to two months to complete. Ms. Liu said it is very important to see what the existing condition is but it will still not represent the future baseline situation because 30%-40% growth for population, household and employment. The baseline projects there will be the majority

of the RTIP projects that basically goes up to 2008. Ms. Liu said some problems may be faced concerning the baseline projections and over capacity that are unknown at this time.

Mr. Taira raised the job/housing balance ratio. Ms. Liu said there will be some further discussions on how to define the range. The future job/household ratio should be maintained at a minimum or should be greater with what percentage, etc. This will be subject to some detailed discussions on the quantification of the range and the ratio.

Mr. Wilson said he believed the kind of criteria should be separated. Mr. Wilson mentioned that under subregions, traffic-bottlenecks are unreasonable infrastructure requirements. Mr. Wilson said those are practical criteria that he presumed would be at regional and subregional levels, that is completely different than doing a statistical evaluation as to whether or not it is consistent with the federal census and the federal employment trends, etc. Mr. Wilson also agreed that “reasonable” and “unreasonable” should have a working definition.

Ms. Liu said at this point the process works as follows: After the baseline is established, investment dollars are allocated to improve the transportation infrastructure. Then the distribution of the growth is reviewed. Ms. Liu said after listening to Mr. Wilson’s comments, a look should also be taken at the impact from the reverse direction as well. If the reallocation of the growth indicates some potential problem, then the investment strategy should be reevaluated. Mr. Wilson said it seems reasonable that a regional plan would at least be discussed in the process. Ms. Liu said that in regard to the layout of the criteria and Mr. Wilson’s suggestion, three major categories of technical, practical and environmental criteria will be used. Each will be defined by regional, subregional, etc. Mr. Gayk said that under ratios, workers per household (#3 of the regional criteria handout) should be added.

Ms. Liu defined a traffic-bottleneck as being for a 24-hour time period. Ms. Liu suggested looking at the 24-hour period first and then seeking a resolution in terms of the growth redistribution before going any further.

Ms. Liu asked that a small group be formed to focus on the issues discussed for further resolution before the next joint committee meeting. Mr. Wilson concurred to authorize staff to setup a working group as a sounding board to get preliminary feedback and prepare a draft to go out to local governments. Mr. Gayk proposed that staff come back with a set of proposed criteria that the joint committee can look at as an action item.

## **6.0 NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Liu said the trend projections will be released for local review in mid-September. With a two-month timeline, the local review input will be returned by mid-November. At that point, several committee meetings will be held to evaluate the outcome of the local input to form the baseline projections. Consultants and staff will work together to go through the evaluation process. If no problems arise, work can go forward. Baseline projections can then be developed as soon as a consensus or majority agreement is reached. The baseline

projections will be presented to the CEHD and RC for approval. Ms. Liu said that over capacity issue will have to be addressed if problems arise, while evaluation is done at the local input level before the baseline projections are formed. This would be a 2-3 month process.

Ms. Liu discussed the proposed workshops for local review of the socioeconomic trend projections. Ms. Liu said that the workshops are being held upon the request of local jurisdictions and representatives involved with the work. Ms. Liu indicated that this would ensure a better understanding of the variables that will be reviewed and what kind of input is expected. Ms. Liu described the workshops as an outreach effort that SCAG will sponsor to make sure that the upcoming local review process is effective. Ms. Liu asked for local jurisdictions to volunteer facilities. Tentatively, several workshops are scheduled throughout the region. The workshops will be held shortly after the release of the data. Ms. Liu asked that the local jurisdictions spread the word about the upcoming workshops. Fliers will be prepared announcing upcoming workshops. Mr. Wilson suggested that an information piece regarding the local data be distributed to the school districts letting them know about the workshops. Ms. Liu agreed and Mr. Wilson will provide supporting information to help in this effort.

Ms. Liu said that the evaluation criteria will be further discussed at the next FTTF/Subregional Committee meeting.

The FTTF/Subregional Coordinators scheduled the next meeting for Wednesday, September 4, 2002, from 2:00-4:00 p.m.

**ATTENDANCE OF AUGUST 14, 2002  
FTTF/SUBREGIONAL COORDINATORS MEETING**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Dave Bobardt	City of Moorpark
Don Dooley	City of Norwalk
Bill Gayk	CSUF/CDR
Jeff Hamilton	City of Glendale
Lisa Hardy	City of Santa Clarita
Stephen Higa	City of Laguna Niguel
Joan Hoesterey	OCCOG
Stan Hoffman	S. R. Hoffman Associates
Barbara Lazar	City of Burbank
Steve Levy	CCSCE
Siri Payakapan	County of Orange
Ginger Ryba	SANBAG
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	OCCOG
Shelly Sabate	CARB
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Ty Schuiling	SANBAG
Arnie Sherwood	ITS, UCB
Jesse Starke	Godbe Research
Ron Taira	OCTA
Warren Teitz	MWD
Jack Tsao	LA City
Cathy Wahlstrom	City of Ontario
Herman Van Buren	L.A. Planning Department
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans D-7
Kevin Viera	WRCOG
A.J. Wilson	Pomona Valley Educational Found.
Goetz Wolff	CRES

---

**SCAG Staff**

Huasha Liu  
JiHong McDermott  
Steve Weiner  
Susan Wilderson

---

**Public Comment Attendees**

---

---

**Videoconferencers**

---

Mr. Corrie KatesIndian Wells

---

---

**Teleconferencers**

---

Rosa LopezImperial County

---